

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated 6 April 2007, please amend this application as set out. Reconsideration and re-evaluation of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

5 The Examiner objected to the Specification as it did not include the appropriate section headings. Section headings have now been added, therefore it is submitted that this objection should be withdrawn.

Examiner also objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they did not include reference numeral 26 referred to in the description. The new
10 drawing sheet enclosed illustrates reference numeral 26, therefore it is submitted that this objection should now be withdrawn.

Examiner went on to reject claims 1-4 and 14-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lynde 6607031; claims 1, 2, 10, 11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hill et al 6382319; and claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as
15 being anticipated by Williams 2638988. Claims 6 and 7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Applicant notes, with thanks, Examiner's indication that old claims 6 and 7 were allowable if rewritten in independent form. To this end, old claims 1, 14 and 20 have been
20 deleted and new Claims 24-26 added, based upon the following combinations of the old claims: 1, 2, 5 and 6; 14, 2, 5 and 6; and method claim 20, modified to include method steps corresponding to features of old apparatus claims 2, 5 and 6, respectively.

Examiner will note that certain modifications have been made to the old claim language in presenting new claims 24-26. In particular, the old apparatus claims 1 and 14 (on which new

claims 24 and 25 are based) have been drafted in a form more appropriate to present the various limitations of the combinations of old claims indicated above.

Furthermore, reference in old claims 1 and 14 to the barrier controlling fluid flow "passing" the tool has been amended to "past" the tool, which is believed to be a more appropriate term. The corresponding reference in new method claims 26 has also been made.

Additionally, following the incorporation of the subject-matter of old claim 6 into old claims 1 and 14, the language of old claim 6 has been modified to clearly specify that, when the resilient member is held in compression (by the retainer), fluid flow past the tool is allowed. This amendment has been made to clarify the functions of the resilient member/retainer.

Following deletion of old claims 1, 14 and 20 and the addition of new Claims 24-26, old claims 2, 5, 6 and 21 have been deleted. Also, the dependencies of claims 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15-19, 22 and 23 have been amended to refer to the corresponding new independent claim. Certain minor amendments have also been made to old claims 3, 7, 8, 13, 15, 19 and 23 for clarity and/or to bring the claims into line with the relevant new independent claims.

Following Examiner's indication of the allowability of old claims 6 and 7 if redrafted appropriately, Applicant submits that the invention defined by new claims 24, 25 and 26 is distinguished from the disclosures of the references cited by the Examiner, and that the Application is now in order for acceptance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests favourable reconsideration of the present Application in view of the above amendments.

Respectfully Submitted,

16-July-2007
Date

C. Dean Domingue
C. Dean Domingue, Reg. No. 33,682
Perret Doise, APLC
Post Office Box 3408
Lafayette, Louisiana 70502-3408
Phone (337) 262.9000
Fax (337) 262.9001
Customer No. 29166